

## **REMARKS**

Claims 15, 22 and 26 are all the claims pending in the application, and stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 have been cancelled above. In addition, the drawings are objected to. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

### **I. The Drawings**

In response to the objections stated in the Office Action, Applicant has amended Figures 1 and 2 to state “Advanced Intelligence Network”, as described in the specification. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn accordingly.

### **II. The Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 15, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being Crockett, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,336,771), hereinafter referred to as Crockett. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

Crockett teaches that a call is processed in a public switched telephone network (PSTN), in accordance with at least one advanced intelligent network (AIN) telephony service associated with a calling party number or a called party number. The call is initially connected to a voice markup language platform in response to preliminary routing instructions from a service control point, in accordance with the telephony service. Data relating to the telephony service is retrieved and at least one caller query is formulated based on the retrieved data. The caller query is verbally provided to the calling party. Additional data is then received through voice communication from the calling party, including a response to the caller query. The call is routed in accordance with the additional data provided by the caller.

The Office Action proposes that col. 6, lines 10-23 of Crockett teaches that the voice XML is publically available, but that the call control protocol is not. However, Crockett only teaches that once the connection is established, the VXML platform initiates communication with the subscriber telephone. For example, Crockett explains that the VXML platform may initially prompt the subscriber to enter an account number, along with a password or PIN. The subscriber responds by either speaking into the subscriber telephone or depressing the DTMF keys. The VXML platform receives the response and authenticates the subscriber through one of

a number of alternatives. For example, the VXML platform may establish a connection with the SCP through the intranet and retrieve the authentication data associated with the subscriber's account to perform the authentication. Alternatively, the VXML platform may pass the authentication data to the SCP, which performs the authentication and returns an approval or disapproval signal to the VXML platform. The authentication is performed based upon the subscriber's voice print.

Therefore, Crockett does not teach or suggest that the voice XML is publically available, but that the call control protocol is not. Further, Crockett similarly does not teach or suggest that the voice processor provides voice communications between a telephone user and a machine, wherein the routing process routes the telephone call to a voice extensible markup language browser and the converting process is performed by a converter connected to the browser. Thus, Crockett also fails to teach or suggest converting the call control protocol to a voice extensible markup language, wherein the converting process comprises using a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server, using an Advanced Intelligent Network Session Coordinator, and using a Call Control Protocol to Voice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Converter.

In a similar manner, Crockett does not teach or suggest that the routing process routes the telephone call to a voice extensible markup language browser and the converting process is performed by a converter connected to the browser, or forwarding a request for voice instructions from the XML browser to a call control protocol to voice XML converter, wherein the call control protocol is not publicly available and the voice extensible markup language is publicly available.

More specifically, Applicants submit that Crockett fails to teach or suggest a method that “consists of routing said telephone call to a voice processor based upon a call control protocol, wherein said voice processor provides voice communications between a telephone user and a machine, wherein said routing process routes said telephone call to a voice extensible markup language browser, and wherein said call control protocol is not publicly available and said voice extensible markup language is publicly available; and converting said call control protocol to a voice extensible markup language, wherein said converting process is performed by a converter connected to said browser, and wherein said converting process comprises using a Hypertext

Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server, using an Advanced Intelligent Network Session Coordinator, and using a Call Control Protocol to Voice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Converter” as defined by independent claim 15.

Also, Crockett fails to teach or suggest a method that "consists of routing said telephone call to a voice Extensible Markup Language (XML) browser according to said routing instructions, wherein said routing process routes said telephone call to a voice extensible markup language browser; forwarding a request for voice instructions from said XML browser to a call control protocol to voice XML converter, wherein said call control protocol is not publicly available and said voice extensible markup language is publicly available, converting said request for voice instructions to said call control protocol using said converter, wherein said converting process is performed by a converter connected to said browser, and wherein said converting process comprises using a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server, using an Advanced Intelligent Network Session Coordinator, and using a Call Control Protocol to Voice XML Converter" as defined by independent claim 22.

Therefore, it is Applicants’ position that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest many features defined by independent claims 15 and 22 and that such claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, it is Applicants’ position that dependent claim 26 is similarly patentable, not only because of its dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also because of the additional features of the invention it defines. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

### **III. Formal Matters and Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 15, 22, and 26, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

10/840,171

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0469.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 06/16/08

/Frederick W. Gibb, III/  
Frederick W. Gibb, III  
Registration No. 37,629

Gibb & Rahman, LLC  
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Voice: (410) 573-6501  
Fax: (301) 261-8825  
Customer Number: 29154

10/840,171